

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,427	CAVALLI, DIDIER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barry J. O'Brien	2183	

All Participants:

(1) Barry J. O'Brien.

(2) John Woodson.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 September 2004

Time: 2pm ET

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102

Claims discussed:

1, 7, 11 and 17

Prior art documents discussed:

Miu et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,484,271

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant to propose claim amendments that would put the claims in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. The Examiner stated that he did not feel the presently amended claims over came the prior art, as the claim language still, even with the most recently filed amendments, only states "an interrupt request signal" and doesn't specify that the interrupt associated with that signal is the what is being verified as still present, and thus the prior art would still read upon the claim language. The Examiner proposed changing "interrupt request signal" to read "same interrupt request" in independent claim 1 and its dependents, and changing simply adding the word "same" before "interrupt request" in the other independent claims and their dependents, in order to more clearly define what the Applicant argues is the invention (see p.9-11 of the Amendment filed 7/08/04). The Applicant agreed to the changes, and authorized the Examiner to make the changes via Examiner's Amendment. See attached "Reasons for Allowance" for further clarification. .

BEST AVAILABLE COPY